



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,783	05/24/2001	Indra Laksono	VIXS 006	8015
34280	7590	03/14/2006	EXAMINER	
TIMOTHY W. MARKISON VIXS, INC. P.O.BOX 160727 AUSTIN, TX 78736			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/864,783	LAKSONO, INDRA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Reuben M. Brown	2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 & 34-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 34-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 10-14, 34-39, 42-44, & 51-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hylton, (U.S. Pat # 5,708,961)

Considering claims 1 & 42, Hylton teaches a system wherein a shared processing system 10, receives a plurality of TV channels from which the user is enabled to choose a particular desired channel, which meets the claimed, ‘method for isolating a channel of interest from a set of channels in a multimedia system, comprising; ‘receiving the set of channels as a stream of data’, see Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 55-67; col. 5, lines 40-50.

‘interpreting segments of the stream of data to identify data of the channel of interest’, ‘interpreting the data of the channel of interest to determine the type of data’ is met by the disclosure in Hylton, col. 8, lines 35-67 thru col. 9, lines 1-10 & col. 11, lines 15-35, which discloses that when a subscriber makes selection of a particular program, that the DET 102

compiles message identifying the program, which then selects the appropriate program by channel mapping, using packet identifiers.

‘providing the processed data for display’ is met by Hylton providing decompressed data to a TV 103, via the TIM 101 & DET 102, see Fig. 1.

Considering claims 2-3 & 43-44, Hylton is directed to receiving a plurality of MPEG transport streams, which inherently include packet data with header and payload portions, such that the header portion contains data of the channel of interest, see col. 11, lines 9-40.

Considering claims 10-11 & 51-52, the claimed application data being stored in memory is broad enough to read on the disclosure in Hylton of storing at least two frames of data in a RAM buffer, see col. 15, lines 1-60.

Considering claims 12 & 53 the MPEG data stream in Hylton includes frame headers and frame payload, and interpreting the frame header to determinate data of the channel of interests, see col. 11, lines 10-40; col. 21, lines 35-50.

Considering claims 13 & 54, see Hylton, col. 8, lines 35-50.

Considering claims 14 & 55, Hylton decodes the received MPEG stream.

Considering claim 34, the claimed client module for use in a multimedia system, which comprises: a network interface controller operably coupled to receive encoded channel data that represents a set of channels, such that the NIC extracts data relating to a channel of interest from the encoded channel data, is met by the operation of the shared processing system 10, in Hylton, Fig 1; col. 4, lines 55-67; col. 5, lines 40-50.

‘video decoder to decode the data relating to the channel of interest to produce decoded data’, is met by the operation of the DET 102, see col. 9, lines 1-25 & col. 14, lines 30-67.

‘rendering module’ reads on the TV 103.

Considering claims 35-36, see col. 14, lines 20-67.

Considering claim 37, the NIC reads on the TIM 101 of Hylton, see col. 8, lines 1-45.

Considering claims 38-39, the see Hylton, col. 8, lines 5-65.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-5 & 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton, in view of Mills, (U.S. Pat # 6,311,204).

Considering claims 4-5 & 45-46, Hylton teaches that the received MPEG data is processed before being displayed, but does not disclose the feature of converting YUV data and RGB data. Nevertheless Mills, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches a decoder system that receives MPEG video data (col. 9, lines 35-55) and converts RGB data to YUV data, col. 13, lines 30-55. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of converting RGB to YUV data, at least for the purpose of enabling a particular interpolation and blending process, as taught by Mills, col. 2, lines 18-40.

5. Claims 6-7 & 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton & Mills as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Leone, (U.S. Pat # 6,901,153).

Considering claims 6 & 47, Hylton & Mills do not discuss the claimed feature of 'Huffman decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and 'de-quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which is de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, 'performing IDCT upon the de-Q data' and 'motion compensation and scaling', see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Considering claims 7 & 48, Leone teaches converting the YUV to RGB data, see col. 2, lines 50-67.

6. Claims 8-9 & 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton as applied to claims 3 & 44 above, and further in view of Sueyoshi, (U.S. Pat # 6,295,319).

Considering claims 8-9 & 49-50, even though Hylton teaches determining the type of data, such as audio or video, by looking at the PID, the reference does not discuss converting the audio into PCM. Nevertheless, Sueyoshi teaches converting the audio MPEG data in to PCM and holding in a buffer, see col. 4, lines 55-61; col. 5, lines 6-15 & col. 7, lines 37-67. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of converting audio data to PCM as taught by Sueyoshi, for the desirable improvement of a standard audio decoding algorithm that provides and enhanced sound production.

7. Claims 15, 40 & 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton.

Considering claims 15 & 56, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, multilevel coding/decoding, non-return-to-zero coding/decoding, block coding/decoding, and nB/m coding/decoding of data streams were old in the art. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the well known features of multilevel coding/decoding, non-return-to-zero coding/decoding, block coding/decoding, and nB/m coding/decoding, at least for the desirable advantage of added compression by allowing more symbols to be transmitted/received per given bandwidth which allows a more efficient transmission scheme.

Considering claim 40, Official Notice is taken that at the time the invention was made, reception of Internet signals was well known in the art. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the known technique of CSMA for detecting Internet data, at least for the desirable benefit of utilizing an already known data detection algorithm.

8. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hylton, in view of Leone.

Considering claim 41, Hylton does not discuss the claimed feature of 'Huffman decoding' or 'de-zigzagging the Huffman decoded data to produce the de-zz data' and 'de-quantizing the de-zz data to produce de-Q data'. However, Leone which is in the same field of endeavor of decoding compressed MPEG data, teaches Huffman decoded video data, which his de-zigzagged and de-quantized, see col. 2, lines 25-36. It would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hylton with the feature of Huffman decoding, de-zigzagging and de-quantizing video data, for the improvement of providing a more precisely processed video stream, as taught by Leone. Leone specifically teaches that de-quantizing the data and de-zigzagging the data, removes the diagonal pixel ordering used by the MPEG to improve the run length processing.

Leone also teaches the claimed, 'performing IDCT upon the de-Q data' and 'motion compensation and scaling', see col. 2, lines 30-38 & col. 2, lines 60-67.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
-
- A) Tripathy, Wasilewski Teaches receiving a multiplexed data stream.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown

Reuben M. Brown
REUBEN M. BROWN
PATENT EXAMINER